IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1971
NO. 71-1208

JACK ROSE,
Petitioner, Defendant and Appellant Below

and

DORIS ROSE,
Respondent, Plaintiff and Defendant and Appellee Below

vs.

NATIONAL BANK OF DETROIT,
Respondent, Plaintiff and Appellee Below.

PETITION FOR REHEARING OF ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Jack Rose
23999 West Ten Mile Road
Southfield, Michigan 48075

THE INLAND PRESS, DETROIT, MICHIGAN



IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1971
NO. 71-1208

JACK ROSE,
Petitioner, Defendant and Appellant Below

and

DORIS ROSE,
Respondent, Plaintiff and Defendant and Appellee Below

vs.

NATIONAL BANK OF DETROIT,
Respondent, Plaintiff and Appellee Below.

PETITION FOR REHEARING OF ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

To the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States of America who favored denying Petition for Writ of Certiorari

Petitioner demands that a writ of certiorari issue to review orders of the Oakland County Circuit Court of the State of Michigan, writ of certiorari to review which orders was denied by this Court on April 24, 1972.

CERTIFICATE OF PETITIONER

Petitioner certifies upon pain of perjury that this petition for rehearing is presented in good faith and not for delay. Petitioner also certifies that the grounds for rehearing are confined to intervening circumstances of substantial and controlling effect if this Court's denial of his petition for writ of certiorari is such a circumstance. If not, petitioner certifies that the grounds for rehearing although not previously presented are substantial.

Jack Rose

GROUNDS FOR REHEARING

Once upon a time petitioner was deprived of his liberty by the State of Michigan without due process of law; he had never even set eyes on the "judges" who ordered his arrest. Petitioner applied to the Federal District Court in Detroit to avoid imprisonment. But that Court insisted that it had no jurisdiction to enforce rights granted under the "due process" clause of the fourteenth amendment to the United States Constitution. After serving two and a half months in the Oakland County jail, petitioner asked his attorney how a person secures enforcement of his constitutional rights. The attorney advised petitioner of the procedure—a petition to the United States Supreme Court for writ of certiorari after state remedies were exhausted. Peti-

tioner suggested that this could not be the correct procedure, because the granting of a writ of certiorari is discretionary while constitutional guarantees are matters of right. The attorney told petitioner not to complain of a discretionary denial of a writ of certiorari until it was in fact denied. Well, petitioner's writ has now been denied and petitioner does complain—he complains bitterly of the hypocrites on this bench who flout the United States Constitution after solemnly promising to support it.

RELIEF

Petitioner demands his constitutional rights.

Jack Rose
23999 W. Ten Mile Rd.
Southfield, Mich. 48075
Tel. 313-352-0952

Dated: Law Day, 1972